1 BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 IN THE MATTER OF INDUSTRIAL ROCK PRODUCTS, INC., 4 Appellant, PCHB Nos. (80-15), 80-1585 and 80-159 v. 6 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND 7 CONTROL AGENCY, ORDER 8 9

THIS MATTER, the appeal of three \$250 civil penalties, Nos. 4761, 4762 and 4763, for causing an outdoor fire allegedly in violation of respondent's Sections 8.02(3), 8.05(1) and 9.03(b)(2), of Regulation I, came on for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings Board, Marianne Craft Norton, Member, convened at Tacoma, Washington, on December 12, 1980. Hearing Examiner William A. Harrison presided.

Appellant appeared through its attorney, Martin E. McQuaid.

Respondent appeared by its attorney, Keith D. McGoffin.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Having reviewed the Proposed Order of the presiding officer mailed to the parties on the 5th day of January, 1981, and more than twenty days having elapsed from said service; and The Board having received no exceptions to said Proposed Order and the Board being fully advised in the premises; NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that said Proposed Order containing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order dated the 5th day of January, 1981, and incorporated by reference herein and attached hereto as Exhibit A, are adopted and hereby entered as the Board's Final Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order herein. DATED this  $25^{-1}$  \_ day of March, 1981. POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

1 BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 IN THE MATTER OF INDUSTRIAL ROCK PRODUCTS, INC., 4 Appellant, PCHB Nos. 80-157, 80-158 5 & 80-159 v. 6 PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION 7 CONTROL AGENCY, AND ORDER Respondent. 8 9

This matter, the appeal of three \$250 civil penalties, Nos. 4761, 4762 and 4763, for causing an outdoor fire allegedly in violation of respondent's Sections 8.02(3), 8.05(1) and 9.03(b)(2), of Regulation I, came on for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings Board, Marianne Craft Norton, Member, convened at Tacoma, Washington, on December 12, 1980. Hearing Examiner William A. Harrison presided. Respondent elected a formal hearing pursuant to RCW 43.218.230.

Appellant appeared through its attorney, Martin E. McQuaid.

Respondent appeared by its attorney, Keith E. McGoffin. Reporter

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Lloyd Holloway recorded the proceedings.

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were examined. From testimony heard and exhibits examined, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes these

## FINDINGS OF FACT

Respondent, pursuant to RCW 43.21B.260 has filed with this Board a certified copy of its Regulation I containing respondent's regulations and amendments thereto of which official notice is taken.

II

Appellant, Industrial Rock Products, Inc., operates a rock quarry 2-1/2 miles south of Monroe, Washington. On June 17, 1980, the Monroe Fire Department received a citizen complaint about smoke and flyash emanating from the quarry. The Chief of the Fire Department investigated, and observed a fire some 150' long, 30' deep and 6' high. It was unattended, and there was no source of nearby water. This information was relayed to respondent, Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency (PSAPCA), whose inspector arrived at the scene about 4:00 p.m. He observed the same fire which contained:

- 1. Natural vegetation (about 20%).
- 2. Broken boards from a building demolition project (about 80%).
- 3. Asphalt chunks as from a broken roadway (scattered).

III

The inspector observed the opacity of the smoke emissions which were light blue and of 100% opacity for a period of 6 consecutive minutes.

 $\sigma$ 

IV

Respondent's inspector contacted the quarry office manager who, when informed of the fire, produced a permit from the State Department of Natural Resources for forest fire abatement. This permit allowed the burning of two 15 x 15 piles, one at a time, with someone in attendance at all times and with water present. Appellant had no written permit from respondent, PSAPCA.

Appellant later received three notices and orders of civil penalty citing the following regulations and assessing the following civil penalties:

- 1. Section 8.02(3) \$250
- 2. Section 8.05(1) \$250
- 3. Section 9.03(b)(2) \$250

From these appellant appeals.

VI

Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings the Board comes to the following

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I

Section 8.02(3) of respondent's Regulation I prohibits the burning of asphalt. By burning chunks of asphalt, appellant violated that section. As will be further developed below, appellant also violated Section 8.02(4) by burning broken boards from a demolition project as

that section prohibits burning for the purpose of demolition of materials.

ΙI

Section 8.05(1) of respondent's Regulation I prohibits, without a PSAPCA permit, any outdoor fire other than for landclearing or residential burning. Appellant has not been shown to have violated this section for two reasons. First, the preponderant part of the fire consisted of broken boards from a demolition project, the burning of which is prohibited in Section 8.02(4). It therefore follows that no PSAPCA permit could have been obtained for this burning. As to the balance of the fire consisting of natural vegetation, respondent has not proven that this material did not originate on the lands in question. Such a fire thus qualifies as a land clearing fire. Section 1.07(nn). Respondent has also not proven that the fire occurred in a locality requiring a prior population density verification by the agency. See Section 8.06(3). Hence for most of the fire a PSAPCA permit cannot be legally obtained, and for the balance of the fire a PSAPCA permit isn't needed.

III

In emitting an air contaminant, smoke, for more than three minutes in any one hour, which contaminant is of an opacity obscuring an observer's view to a degree equal to or greater than does smoke designated as No. 1 on the Ringelmann Chart (20% density), appellant violated Section 9.03(b)(2) of respondent's Regulation I. Appellant is not entitled to the protection of Section 8.10 exempting outdoor

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

fires from Section 9.03 where such fires comply with Article 8 because appellant has violated Section 8.02(3) of Article 8 (see Conclusion of Law II, above).

ΙV

Whereas this Board will extend leniency to those making a good faith effort to comply with the law as it may appear to them, appellant is not entitled to such leniency because of its Department of Natural Resources permit. Not only was the burn pile 10 times the bulk allowed by that permit but it was burned with disregard for the conditions requiring attendance and water. Moreover, appellant has casually undertaken to burn what is preponderantly building demolition material under a permit expressly limited to the prupose of forest fire abatement. For these reasons the civil penalties assessed are justifiable as to amount.

V

Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings the Board enters this

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

ORDER The violations and two \$250 civil penalties relating to Sections 8.02(3) and 9.03(b)(2) are hereby affirmed. The violation and \$250 civil penalty relating to Section 8.05(1) is hereby reversed.  $m{q}$ day of January, 1981. DONE at Lacey, Washington, this POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER